DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 251 SP 020 395

AUTHOR Tabachnick, B. Robert; And Others
TITLE The Impact of the Student Teaching Experience on the Development of Teacher Perspectives.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 82
GRANT NIE-G-81-0009
NOTE 75p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Beliefs; *Conformity; Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; Peer Influence; Preservice Teacher Education; School Community Relationship; Social Adjustment; *Socialization; Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Role; Teaching Experience; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Research findings on teachers' perspectives on teaching tend to indicate that institutional pressures are not strong enough to control what teachers think and how they act within their classrooms. While teachers will conform to organizational demands, their basic teaching styles are likely to remain unchanged. This study explored the socializing effects of the student teaching experience on the perspectives on teaching of 13 student teachers. Before the start of their student teaching, the subjects responded to the Teacher Belief Inventory (TBI). The TBI was developed to assess teacher beliefs related to six specific categories: (1) teacher role: passive-active; (2) teacher-pupil relationship: custodial-humanistic; (3) knowledge and curriculum: strong frame-weak frame; (4) student diversity: negative-positive; (5) the role of the community in school affairs: passive-active; and (6) the role of the school in society: reproductive-transformative. Responses in each of these areas provided a profile of teacher beliefs that comprised the individual's perspectives on teaching. In addition to completing the TBI, each student teacher was interviewed at least five times between January and May, 1981, and observed while teaching at least three times. Interviews were also held with pupils, cooperating teachers, and supervisors to discover developments of perspectives of the student teachers, any observed changes, and influences that might induce change. Resulting data indicated that student teaching did not result in an homogenization of student teacher perspectives. Students came into the experience with different perspectives on teaching and significant differences among them remained at the end of the semester. Little evidence was found of passive response to institutional forces. It should be noted, however, that the subjects of this study selected the schools in which they did their student teaching and, in this selection, naturally chose positions in schools most reflecting their own perspectives. (JD)

ED218251

THE IMPACT OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

By

B. Robert Tabachnick, Kenneth M. Zeichner,
Kathleen Densmore, Susan Adler, and Kathleen Egan
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March, 1982.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Robert Tabachnick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 020 395

The research reported in this paper was funded by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research which is supported in part by a grant from the National Institute of Education (Grant No. NIE-G-81-0009). The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education.

THE IMPACT OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

This paper will describe perspectives toward teaching of student teachers during the final semester of their university teacher education program. We shall be particularly concerned to explore the following questions: (1) What were the perspectives of student teachers during their final student teaching semester? (2) What changes in perspective occurred during the 15-week student teaching experience? (3) What was the relative contribution of the psychological context (e.g., teachers' implicit theories and intentions) and the social context (especially external resources and institutional constraints) to the development of student teacher perspectives?

In their research with medical students, Becker, Geer, Hughes, and Strauss (1961) discovered perspectives toward the practice of medicine which are very commonly characteristic of medical students. As they developed the concept, perspectives referred to

> A coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and acting on such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained in the perspective. Similarly, the ideas can be seen by an observer to be one of the possible sets of ideas which might form the underlying rationale for the person's actions and are seen by the actor as providing a justification for acting as he does. (p. 34)

Becker et al. believed perspectives to differ from attitudes since perspectives include actions and not merely dispositions to act. Unlike values, perspectives are specific to situations, rather than generalized beliefs.

By citing their debt to George Herbert Mead's The Philosophy of the Act, Becker and his colleagues indicate that conventional metaphors do not adequately portray the interplay of thought and action that become a group perspective within some professions. In an earlier paper (Tabachnick, Popkewitz, & Zeichner, 1979-80),[1] we applied this conception to teaching, commenting that "teacher perspectives or perspectives toward teaching refer to the ways in which teachers think about their work (e.g., purposes and goals, conceptions of curriculum and children) and the ways in which they give meaning to these beliefs by their actions in classrooms." The point of that sentence was to suggest that the meaning of ideas and beliefs could not be understood in the absence of actions intended (by the actors) to complete the ideas, to "express" them. Unfortunately, that statement can be interpreted to mean that action follows idea. The statement does not make clear (as the discussion in Boys in White does) that neither idea nor action necessarily precedes or causes the other. That language also implies two distinct though mutually interdependent entities (beliefs and actions) and does not capture Mead's conception of the act. In a brief but wonderfully lucid discussion that uses Mead's concept of the act to explain teacher behavior, Berlak and Berlak (1981) portray thought and action as part of the same event. If we were making an analogy to an object, we might say that we can't

separate the head from the tail of a coin and still have the coin. Teaching is not an object but a dynamic continuing process. If we catch glimpses of actions, we can easily discover beliefs or ideas that are an integral part of those acts though they were not immediately perceived to be so. Similarly, if we hear a statement of belief, we can (with somewhat more effort than in the other case) discover actions that are integrally a part of the ideas stated.

Since teaching takes place in schools, this delicately complex view of social behavior is further complicated by the interaction of individuals and social institutions. In the conception of Berger and Luckmann (1967) institutions are recognized as being established by people; they change as the people who make them work, change. At the same time, an institution has a history and an existence which precedes and overshadows the individuals who are its agents and its clients; it is bigger than they are, though it responds to influences from them. The perspectives toward teaching of individual teachers would, in such a model, be influenced by the institutional imperatives, rewards, and punishments that each teacher encounters in a school; while at the same time, expressions of individual thought and action by teachers change the institutional meanings that existed before the teachers joined the institution. This change may be minimal or it may be significant. Much recent research has reported the powerful resilience of institutional inertia (e.g., Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Stake & Easley, 1978; Popkewitz, Tabachnick, & Wehlage, 1982). However, institutions do change. Within institutions that resist change, individual teachers manage to teach in styles that contradict the overall institutional style while at the same time these teachers retain the support

of their colleagues, administrators, and the parents of their pupils. While it is clear that it occurs, it is not at all clear how some of the conflicts and interactive dynamics between individuals and institutions encourage some teachers to conform to institutional pressures and other teachers to resist; some teachers to succeed in resisting while maintaining their professional status, while other teachers resist only at the cost of hostility from professional colleagues and, sometimes, dismissal.

There is disagreement about the kinds of perspectives toward teaching which teachers have and particularly about shared or group perspectives. After examining questionnaires and interviews completed by teachers, Lortie (1975) concluded that teachers were quite unlike doctors in that teachers did not share group perspectives. Lortie found teachers to be highly individualistic in their perspectives toward teaching, concluding, even, that there was little knowledge that was accepted by most practitioners as forming the basis of their professional expertise. Independent assessments, incorporating intuitive understanding, appeared to Lortie to guide the beliefs and classroom behavior of teachers. Other researchers find that teachers have many beliefs and classroom behaviors in common. LeCompte (1978), for example, reports that teachers, regardless of their other differences, agree about the importance of a "management core" of teaching behavior needed to control pupil behavior so that teacher-planned activities can take place.

Most researchers group teachers along a single dimension into two groups--informal/formal, humanistic/custodial, direct/indirect,

dominative/integrative, production/craftsman. Bipolar unidimensional analyses of teaching are rejected by Hammersley (1977) as oversimplifying the complex diversity of teaching and by Carew and Lightfoot (1979) as too narrow and reductionist. Their analyses of teaching perspectives are considerably more complex and more subtle, as are those of such researchers as Metz (1978), Bussis, Chittendon, and Amarel (1976), and Barr and Duffy (1978).

Bussis, Chittendon, and Amarel (1976) and Berlak and Berlak (1981) report a range of differences within each of the categories "progressive" and "traditional." At the same time they find characteristics which are common to teachers who would otherwise be classified as one or the other of these types. Metz (1978) found that among incorporative teachers, those emphasizing the transmission of knowledge to pupils, there were differences within the category that grouped teachers of this type into a number of subcategories. These teachers shared certain essential characteristics that maintained the integrity of the category and their placement within it.

In commenting on the range of perspectives within a teaching style, Berlak and Berlak (1981) comment,

> Despite their ambiguities, the labels formal/informal as commonly used in the schools we visited, do in some general way distinguish two sets of teachers. . . . However, it is only in dealing with the extremes that this division does not present insurmountable problems. . . . There is clearly a wide range of patterns that teachers and kids commonly associated with informal, and a range they associated with formal. (p. 199)

In addition to a range of behavior within a category or type, many researchers comment upon contradictory patterns of belief and action

which they teach. Since the teachers who were studied were not observed under classroom conditions but were asked to respond to vignettes invented by the authors, Shavelson and Stern (1981) caution that "before reaching the conclusion that teachers are responsive to many external pressures note that this was a laboratory study in which teachers did not have to face the consequences of their decisions. The generalizability of this finding to practice still needs to be examined." This caution is strengthened by such results as those reported by Metz (1978) where diverse perspectives are discovered within each of the schools that she studied. Gracey (1972) found production and craftsman teachers in a single school, although he concluded that the school and community forced craftsman teachers to compromise their positions. Carew and Lightfoot (1979) and Sharp and Greene (1976) also found different perspectives within the same school. All of these results would seem to contradict the view that institutional pressures are, by themselves, strong enough to control what teachers think and how they are likely to act within their classrooms. They appear to support the position that

> Persons' activities may not be understood apart from their biographies and the histories of the groups with whom they identify and which live on in consciousness or apart from the time and place in which they act. (Berlak & Berlak, 1981, p. 111)

If institutional press is strong enough to overpower any opposition, we should find a "homogenizing" of student teacher perspectives in our study. If individual perspectives matter, in that they interact with institutional pressures in such a way as to protect and nurture alternative styles of action, we should find some trace of that in the perspectives of student teachers during their final student teaching experience.

among teachers (e.g., Hammersley, 1977; Berlak & Berlak, 1981). It is not surprising to find contradictions and inconsistencies within the perspectives of individual teachers since constradictions are embedded in the society and reflect a diversity of beliefs and the appeals of alternative actions in the face of choice. Unidimensional bipolar types are usually derived theoretically and a priori and are often unable to deal with the subtleties presented by a social context when it is observed directly.

With the exception of Hammersley's study, these reports do not explicitly search for dimensions of teacher perspectives but examine teacher opinions and actions. All of them appear to be convinced from their data that what teachers think, matters since it directs in a general way how teachers act, although these actions will be influenced by the institutional constraints which teachers find within particular schools. Their analyses would seem to confirm Bennett (1976) in his comment that, "Aims and opinions are strongly held and they are related closely to actual classroom practice. They do, however, seem to be mediated to some extent by external factors such as the characteristics of the children taught and [of the] school . . . ." At least one study, that by Schwille, Porter, and Gant (1979), reports results that run counter to all of these. As summarized by the researchers, "The most notable aspect of [teachers'] responses to the vignettes was a willingness to change content, whatever the pressure for change." These results may be interpreted to suggest that teacher perspectives are of little account, since teachers respond without much resistance to pressures for conformity from the institutions in

The Student Teaching Experience

Currently there is a great deal of debate in the literature over the role that the student teaching experience plays in the development of teachers and over the relative contribution of various individual institutional factors to the socialization process (Zeichner, 1980). On the one hand, some have argued that biography as opposed to formal training or teaching experience is the key element in teacher socialization and that student teaching plays little part in altering the perspectives that students bring to the experience. For example, Lortie (1975) argues that the socialization of teachers largely occurs through the internalization of teaching models during the thousands of hours spent as pupils in close contact with teachers ("apprenticeship of observation"). In Lortie's view, it is the activation of this latent culture with the onset of school experience that is the major influence in shaping students' conceptions of the teaching role and role performance. Formal training in pedagogy at the university, including student teaching, is seen as having little effect in comparison with the efficacy of pre-training experiences. In fact, Lortie (1975, p. 80) even questions the use of the term socialization to describe entry into the teaching role:

> The connotations of the term socialization seem somewhat askew when applied to this kind of induction, since they imply greater receptivity to a preexisting culture than seems to prevail.

This view, which emphasizes the primacy of biography in teacher development has received empirical support in a recent United States

study conducted by Zeichner and Grant (1981), in an Australian study conducted by Petty and Hogben (1980), and in two British studies (Maddox, 1968; Mardle and Walker, 1980). It is also consistent with several other views of teacher development that locate the major socializing influences at a point prior to the advent of formal training (e.g., Stephens, 1967; Wright & Tuska, 1968).

On the other hand, some have argued that student teaching does have a significant impact on the development of teachers, an effect which is then strengthened in the early years of a teacher's career. However, while there is a great deal of agreement here over the potency of impact, there is also much disagreement among the advocates of this position about the specific nature of the impact and about the individual and institutional factors that are related to student teacher development.

First, there are those who argue that student teaching represents the beginning of a process where the allegedly "liberalizing" impact of campus-based preparation is reversed and who see the universities and schools in conflict over the allegiance of student teachers. Several British and North American studies provide evidence that the impact of campus-based teacher education is "washed out" beginning during student teaching and continuing on into later teaching experience (see Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981). The major debate among those who hold this view is over which particular socializing agents or mechanism play the most influential role in reversing the impact of the college. Cooperating teachers (Yee, 1969), the ecological characteristics of classrooms (Copeland, 1980), and the bureaucratic characteristics of schools (Hoy & Rees, 1977) are examples of some of the

individual and institutional factors that have been seen to play influential roles during student teaching.

Secondly, there are those who argue that student teaching plays a significant role in teacher development, but who emphasize the continuity between campus-based preparation, student teaching, and later experience. According to this view, the effects of campus-based preparation are not "washed out" by student teaching and later school experience but are in fact strengthened by those experiences, and the schools and colleges are seen as working in consort in their effects upon teacher development. Those who hold this view typically examine the impact of formal preparation including student teaching within a larger sociopolitical context. Campus-based training, student teaching, and later school experience are all seen as furthering the development of teachers who subscribe to educational commitments which do not challenge existing occupational, institutional, and cultural patterns. Dale's (1977) arguments related to the development of a "cognitive style of individualism," and Bartholomew's (1976) analysis of the development of an "objectivist conception of knowledge," during formal training and later teaching experience are illustrative of this position. While student teaching is not singled out by the advocates of this position as uniquely influential, it is viewed as having an effect which solidifies and confirms perspectives that are brought to the experience.

Despite the existence of these conflicting views of the role of student teaching in the development of teachers and of studies which lend support to each of the three positions, we generally know very

little about the actual impact of student teaching on the professional perspectives of student teachers. There are several reasons for our current lack of knowledge in this area and which point to the need for further studies of the student teaching experience.

First, despite the literally hundreds of studies that have been conducted on the impact of student teaching relatively few researchers have actually examined what takes place during the experience itself; how professional life is interpreted and acted upon as students participate in its ongoing affairs. Most studies, by relying exclusively upon the pre and post administration of questionnaires and surveys for their data and by not observing and talking with students as the experience evolves, have failed to address many important questions related to this experience. Because the impact of student teaching (i.e., if there is an impact) occurs during student teachers' daily interactions with children and with school and university personnel (Tabachnick, 1981) and because much of what students actually learn during this experience may often be unanticipated by program designers (Romberg & Fox, 1976), most of the extant research on student teaching has failed to penetrate the complex and interactive world of the student teacher and has failed to illuminate the nature of salient socializing mechanisms that may operate during this experience. Generally, and despite the existence of the conflicting scenarios summarized above, we know very little about the actual impact of the student teaching experience on the way in which students actually respond to the problematic conditions of the classroom. The actions

and interactions of student teachers during the experience must be treated as problematic if we are to understand the impact of student teaching upon students.

Secondly, and closely related to the overreliance on pre- and post-test designs is the fact that most studies of student teaching have been largely limited to investigations of student teacher ideologies. Sharp and Green (1975, p. 68-69) define a teaching ideology as "a connected set of systematically related beliefs and ideas about what are felt to be the essential features of teaching . . . a broad definition of the task and a set of prescriptions for performing it, all held at a relatively high level of abstraction." This description of a teaching ideology is highly similar to Argyris and Schon's notion of "espoused theory" and Keddie's (1971) description of the "educationalist context." Sharp and Green (1975) distinguish a teaching ideology from the more situationally specific and action-oriented construct of teacher perspective which is analogous to Argyris and Schon's (1974) "theory in use" and to Keddie's (1971) "teacher context."

By focusing almost exclusively upon student teacher ideologies and expressed attitudes (independent of any context), the extant research on student teaching has given us a very limited view of the impact of the experience on the lives of student teachers. As Keddie (1971) has shown, we cannot assume a direct correspondence between teacher ideologies which exist at a fairly high level of abstraction and the perspectives which guide daily classroom practice. Given the inconsistencies and contradictions which exist between these two levels of analysis, it becomes important for researchers to go beyond

the level of ideology to understand adequately the role of student teaching in the development of teachers.

However, despite the general lack of attention to the analysis of perspectives, a small group of studies do exist which have sought to examine the impact of student teaching on the development of teacher perspectives. These studies (Gibson, 1976; Haslam, 1971; Iannaccone, 1963; Popkewitz, 1979; Tabachnick et al., 1979-80) have provided fairly consistent data about the impact of student teaching on the teaching perspectives of student teachers. Generally, these studies indicate that student teaching contributes to the development of "utilitarian" perspectives where what works in the short run to get the class through the required lesson on time in a quiet and orderly manner becomes the major criterion for evaluating a teaching activity. Within this perspective, technique of teaching becomes an end in itself rather than a means toward some specified educational purpose. Survival of student teaching and fulfilling the expectations of others take on primary importance for student teachers.

Although these studies have provided important information about the ways in which the student teaching experience affects the teaching perspectives of student teachers, they all have at least one major weakness which severely limits their usefulness. Specifically, while in each of these studies there were students who did not fit the dominant utilitarian pattern, the reports of the studies focus largely on illuminating the characteristics of the one dominant perspective within the group of student teachers studied. Thus, despite evidence in each of these studies that student teaching to some degree has a

differential impact on students, our knowledge about the teaching perspectives of student teachers is largely limited to the gross indicators of central tendencies. In short, these studies imply an overly deterministic view of the socialization process which is inconsistent with some of their own data; with recent literature on occupational socialization in general (e.g., Bucher & Stelling, 1977); and with recent literature on teacher socialization (e.g., Lacey, 1977). The heterogeneous nature of student teacher perspectives which corresponds to the variety of perspectives existent in the occupation as a whole, has not been adequately addressed by these studies.

In the present study we were interested in expanding upon this previous work on student teacher perspectives in several ways: (1) by documenting the range of diversity of perspectives that existed among a group of student teachers within a given program rather than focusing exclusively on the characteristics of one dominant perspective; (2) by linking the development of perspectives to specific individual and institutional factors both within and prior to the student teaching experience (e.g., Does student teaching alter that which students bring to the experience?); (3) by tracing the development of student teacher perspectives into the early years of teaching experience to determine if student teacher perspectives are in fact "washed out" by school experience and if so, under what circumstances. The present paper discusses the results related to points 1 and 2 above. Data related to how student teacher perspectives are strengthened or changed during the early years of teaching experience are currently being collected and analyzed and will be reported separately at a later date.

Methodology

The subjects for this study were 13 student teachers (all women) who were enrolled in an elementary student teaching program at a large midwestern university during the spring semester of 1981. Student teaching and a weekly campus-based seminar preempt a full university semester (15 weeks) which is the final semester in a four-semester professional sequence leading to certification in grades kindergarten through eight. Prior to this final semester, students have completed two pre-student teaching experiences (of approximately 80 clock hours each) and various courses in elementary methods, educational foundations and general studies.

During December 1980 and January 1981 a 47-item Teacher Belief Inventory (TBI) was developed by the staff of the research project on the basis of our own previous work on teacher perspectives (Tabachnick et al., 1979-80) and on the basis of the literature on teachers (e.g., Bussis et al., 1976). This instrument attempts to assess student teacher beliefs related to six specific categories: (1) the teacher role; (2) teacher-pupil relationships; (3) knowledge and curriculum; (4) student diversity; (5) the role of the community in school affairs; and (6) the role of the school in society. Questions were developed for each of these categories in terms of a single major dimension. No attempt was made to assess the full range of student teacher beliefs about teaching or even the totality of their beliefs within each of the categories. Throughout this paper, the

term teacher perspectives refers only to those specific categories and dimensions that were addressed in the present study.

Following is a summary of the dimensions that were initially employed for each of six orienting categories: (1) teacher role: passive-active; (2) teacher-pupil relationships: custodial-humanistic; (3) knowledge and curriculum: strong frame-weak frame; (4) student diversity: negative-positive; (5) the role of the community in school affairs: passive-active; (6) the role of the school in society: reproductive-transformative.

In January 1981 the TBI was administered to all 48 student teachers who were enrolled in the elementary student teaching program during the spring semester of 1981. Following this initial administration of the TBI, 13 students (a 28 percent sample) were selected for more intensive study. These students were chosen to give us a group of student teachers who appeared to have markedly different beliefs within each category measured by the TBI and whose overall profiles differed markedly from one another. In selecting the 13 students we also sought a representative sample in terms of: (1) the characteristics of the settings in which the student teachers worked (e.g., urban, suburban), and (2) the grade levels at which the student teachers taught (e.g., primary, intermediate). Furthermore, an attempt was made to informally assess the teaching style and teaching environment within the classrooms to which students were assigned, in order to achieve a rough balance of assignments to classrooms where: (1) student beliefs seemed to confirm the existing teaching style; (2) student beliefs seemed to be somewhat different or at variance with

the teaching style and classroom environment developed by the cooperating teacher. Finally, we attempted to include a variety of school organizational patterns in our sample (e.g., IGE., self-contained classrooms) and to select a group of schools which offered the maximum possible diversity in community and pupil characteristics.

The 13 student teachers who were selected were assigned to nine different schools in three school districts. (One student worked in an alternative school.) Five students worked in primary grade classrooms (K-3), seven students were placed in intermediate level classrooms (4-5), and one student worked in a K-5 setting. In addition, 11 students worked in "regular" elementary classrooms, one student worked in a bilingual classroom, and one student was placed in a junior primary classroom designed for pupils who had finished kindergarten but who were deemed not yet ready for first grade. Finally, four students worked in settings that employed some form of team teaching (e.g., IGE), and the remaining nine students worked in essentially self-contained classrooms with one cooperating teacher.

Between January and May 1981, each of the 13 student teachers was interviewed at least five times and observed while teaching at least three times. Each of the five researchers worked with two to four students and followed the same students throughout the semester. The staff of the project met weekly to discuss the observational and interview data, to identify themes which emerged, and to plan for succeeding interviews and observations. The student teachers were provided with transcriptions of all of their interviews and were invited to clarify, elaborate, or suggest changes to their original responses.

In the first interview we attempted to confirm our initial interpretation of the student profiles that were constructed on the basis of the TBI; to construct a brief biographical history of each student (e.g., to identify unique factors in their upbringing and school experience); and to identify the students' expectations and goals for the student teaching semester, together with their reasons for selecting their classroom placements. In subsequent interviews we sought to explore in some depth student teacher beliefs regarding each of the six orienting categories and to discover any new significant and empirically grounded dimensions of perspectives that we had not anticipated.

A portion of each interview was guided by a set of broad questions which were intended to clarify students' positions related to the six orienting categories of the TBI. While each researcher utilized the same basic questions for each interview (the questions were developed collectively in the weekly meetings), there was enough flexibility in the design for individual researchers to probe areas that were of particular significance for understanding the perspectives of specific students. Finally, three of the five interviews included a line of questioning based on the specific lessons observed (the interviews followed the observations), which sought to clarify the observers' perceptions of the lessons, students' intentions for the lesson, and which generally enabled us to understand how students gave meaning to their actions after they occurred. Finally, the classroom observations lasted for a minimum of one-half day. Each observer constructed narrative descriptions of events in students' classrooms,

and the research team developed a specific focus for each of the three observations.

In addition to identifying the substance and dimensions of the perspectives of the 13 student teachers, we sought to examine through interviews with students, cooperating teachers, and supervisors the sources of influence related to the development of the perspectives and how (if at all) the perspectives changed during the course of the student teaching semester. The cooperating teacher(s) and university supervisor for each student were interviewed once at the end of the semester regarding their views about the teaching perspectives of their student teachers, their perceptions of changes that occurred in these perspectives over the course of the semester and about how they attempted to influence, and felt they did in fact influence, their students.

Each member of the triad was also asked about the degree and nature of the constraints they saw being placed upon what and how the student teacher taught, either by the student him/herself, the cooperating teacher, the school or the university, and about their perceptions of how the other triad members had influenced the student teacher over the course of the semester. For example, student teachers were asked about what they felt they could and could not do in the classroom, about their perceptions of the expectations of the school and university for their behavior and about how they felt the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in fact influenced their development. Also, the weekly campus-based seminars for six of the

student teachers were observed and taped to provide an additional source of information related to the influence of the university. Finally, the TBI was administered again in May 1981 to all student teachers in the program. Thirty-nine students returned usable responses from both the January and May administrations. Two-tailed t-tests were then conducted with the data from the 39 students to determine the existence and nature of any shifts in student beliefs in terms of the six orienting categories.* Also, an item analysis was conducted on the pre- and post-test TBI data for each of the 13 students, and changes in the beliefs of the 13 students were compared with the changes in the total group of 39 students. All of these data, together with our own observations of students' teaching, were used to draw conclusions about the ways in which individual and institutional factors affected the development of student teachers' perspectives.

All of the data that were collected were transcribed to facilitate a content analysis. Nearly 1,500 typed pages of protocol materials were generated from the taped interviews and seminars and from the records of classroom observations. The next step in the analysis was the development of 13 individual profiles that were intended to describe the essence of each student's perspectives toward teaching. While the original six orienting categories were maintained and provided the basis of this analysis, the dimensions of each category were recast to reflect the data that were collected about each student. Thus, some of the original dimensions were dropped or revised, one or two remained the same, and many new dimensions were added to the original six categories to reflect aspects of teachers' perspectives that were

*The quantitative analysis of the TBI data from the 39 students will be reported in another paper.

not originally anticipated. After the profiles were developed from the interview and observational data, an analysis was conducted of students' responses to each item in the TBI. In each instance where the survey data contradicted the data from the interviews and observations, the researchers made a judgment concerning the student's actual perspective. The original profiles were then revised on the basis of this integration of the TBI, interview, and observational data.

The next step in the data analysis was to attempt to identify the similarities and differences among the group of 13 students. Beginning with the dimensions that were developed in the previous step, the individual profiles of the 13 students were compared and contrasted to enable us to determine: (1) if different teaching perspectives existed; (2) if so, to identify the characteristic elements of each perspective. Once we began to discover that different perspectives existed we sought to more fully describe: (1) the differences between different perspectives together with the similarities within a perspective; (2) the similarities between different teaching perspectives; and (3) the differences between individuals within a perspective.

Obviously, if the differences between individuals with a perspective are greater than the differences between individuals across perspectives, the perspectives themselves begin to lose meaning. However, while individuals within each perspective were in fact more similar to each other than to students who were placed in different perspectives, all students within a given perspective were not all

alike and it becomes important to describe the nature of this heterogeneity within each perspective. Thus, the description of these teaching perspectives in the following section does not imply the lack of contradiction within a perspective, nor does it imply total contradiction between perspectives.

Perspectives Toward Teaching Among the Thirteen Students

For each of the 13 students who were studied, data were assembled from three sources. One of these was the Teacher Belief Inventory (TBI) which was administered at the beginning and end of the semester. The second source was the observed teaching in the classrooms to which the students had been assigned. The third source of data was the interviews conducted throughout the semester. Students readily expressed their ideas and were observed in actions related to those components of teacher perspective which we had labeled teacher role, teacher-pupil relations, knowledge and curriculum, and pupil diversity. Students had obviously thought much less about, had less to say about, and were observed rarely in situations in which they acted on those components of teacher perspectives which dealt with community-school relations and school-in-society.

A first analysis grouped students into three sets of perspectives that might roughly be characterized as conservatively traditional, progressive, and a group (possibly two groups) whose members had a mixture of some of the characteristics of conservatively traditional and progressive perspectives. The most disturbing consequence of forming groups in this way was that differences within each group that

might be important, or at least intriguing, were obscured. In order to enable us to recognize and identify important differences within each perspective we turned to the concept of dilemma as developed by Berlak and Berlak (1981). We identified 23 dilemmas related to the six components of perspective which all 13 students recognized, discussed, acted upon in their classrooms. Wherever possible we used labels similar to those used by Berlak and Berlak (1981) in order to minimize the number of new labels and terms. These appear to be genuine dilemmas for most students and they are pulled in contradictory directions by conflicting appeals. In the discussion which follows we shall describe characteristic components of teacher perspective for groups of students by referring to their dominant modes of resolving common dilemmas. Differences that appear to us to be important within each category will be identified. This will be particularly useful in characterizing the alternative responses of students who fall clearly outside of either of the perspectives, conservatively traditional and progressive.

Conservatively Traditional Perspectives

In reacting to pupil diversity, four students with this perspective saw pupils as unique; individual characteristics mattered, rather than descriptions which gave them the assumed characteristics of some group to which they belonged. One person in this group differed by expecting pupils to act in terms of some category, e.g., as low income, inner city, coming from nice families or poor homes, etc. Students tended to believe that the aim of schooling was to socialize pupils to a common culture by offering all students the same curriculum, by

holding all students to the same standards of behavior, and by attempting to allocate resources (time, materials, etc.) equally among all pupils. One student differed from this general perspective by allocating resources differentially, intending and giving more to those who had what she perceived to be the least, especially those perceived to be lower academic achievers. Another student's difference was her acting on her perception of the culturally diverse nature of society and her belief this should be recognized and that pupils should be encouraged to value the contributions of various subcultural groups, e.g., blacks or Hispanics. However, this student, like all others in this group, was explicit about her unwillingness to teach low socioeconomic status pupils or in inner-city schools. As one of her colleagues, Ellen, commented,

> I couldn't see myself teaching at all in a big inner city like Milwaukee or Chicago because it is just not my background. I don't know children in that way. I'm from a rural area. . . . To go to a real inner-city place where there are a lot of black children and races really different from me, I think that would be hard to adjust. I don't even think I'd want to try.

While somewhat more direct or forthright than the comments of the other students in this group, this statement captures a common theme for all five of them and, indeed, for all but four of the 13 students studied, regardless of other dimensions of their perspectives.

The students in this group are very much alike in their perspectives regarding classroom knowledge and curriculum. They think and act as though knowledge exists as an independent entity, not somehow changed by the people who have it. Much that is known is certain, and what is known to be certain is more valuable than what is known

tentatively. For example, Sarah was asked about an incident that had been observed in her classroom.

Interviewer/observer: Did Davy Crockett really kill 105 bears in one year?

Student teacher: That is what it said in the book.

In schools, teachers aim to get correct responses from pupils. That pupils know the right answer or do something in a correct way is more important than the process by which pupils arrive at that product. Efficiency in achieving this product is enhanced if curriculum separates one subject from another, and, where possible, if a skill or some factual content is fragmented into small bits or behaviors, with those taught earlier leading to success in learning those taught later. Eventually it all adds up to understanding. Pupils are seen by these students to learn best when they are required to do their own work rather than receiving or giving help to one another. Classrooms are organized and teaching behavior aims to minimize interaction among pupils except when deliberately intended as a teaching strategy as when groups are formed to narrow the range of pupil abilities in a subject, usually reading but sometimes also mathematics.

Students in this group attempt to maintain a high degree of control over what pupils learn and how they behave in their classrooms. They give frequent reminders to pupils to do what has been assigned in the way that it has been assigned. With the exception of one student who developed close personal interactions with her pupils, the people with this perspective distanced themselves from their pupils, often creating a "technical" relationship, with the criteria for choices being technical or strategic requirements of teaching rather than

anticipated social consequences of teaching. In commenting about punishing her class because a few pupils were disobedient--teacher behavior which had been observed--Ellen explained her actions by saying,

> I had warned them once. Then I thought,"OK, I'll stick to my word." It's just those few who think they can do it. That's the hard part, when there are just a few disobeying and yet you have to hurt them, the whole class.

In general they were fairly bureaucratic in their response to directives coming from "outside." As a group they believed that decisions about what to teach were better made by experts, whether textbook writers, administrators, or curriculum specialists in the school district. Similarly, they were agreed that school regulations were important and should be followed in order to create an orderly place for learning to go on. After regulations were announced, it was each teacher's job to carry them out as best as she could rather than to interpret or invent alternatives to them. It was only with the question of how to teach that these students believed that they should decide rather than any authority that was at a distance from the pupils with whom they worked. All of these students believed that parents should have ready access to the classroom but very limited responsibilities for deciding how the school should be run. They were divided in their views about whether or not parents should have an active involvement in classrooms or in determining the content of curriculum. While it was not an idea that they had thought much about before, all of them believed that problems of inequity in schooling could best be solved through educational solutions rather than structural changes

either in schools or in the communities which schools serve. Interventions were thought to be most useful when aimed at individual children (e.g., educating each child to his/her fullest potential) rather than looking for structural changes in the society or in the school. These were opinions only and none of these students were observed behaving as teachers in the face of dilemmas related to the involvement of the community in school affairs or the relation of school with the broader society.

Teaching from a Progressive Perspective

The world of teaching is seen through a very different lens by the four students who shared a progressive perspective. Students with this perspective acted toward their pupils as though they saw them to have unique qualities and characteristics as individuals rather than the characteristics ascribed to a group. These students differentiated curriculum as a strategy, that is, they planned units (in one classroom the whole curriculum) so that a variety of activities would go on at the same time. They tended to have high expectations of their pupils, expecting them to be capable of successful learning regardless of background, if only their teachers could motivate them and find the correct mixture of activities and materials. Allocating resources faced them with conflicting appeals; to be equitable you have to recognize and respond to the unequal needs of pupils. They tended to resolve the dilemma by allocating more time to low achievers, an extreme example being when Rebecca was observed to spend 33 minutes with a single pupil in order to help him master a concept in arithmetic. (This was a

classroom with a highly diversified curriculum, with several activities going on at once, with pupils who were extremely capable of directing their own learning, and where the cooperating teacher, who was in the classroom at the time, and the student teacher formed a closely cooperating team.) Two of these students aimed to socialize pupils to a common culture, while two encouraged pupils to recognize differences among cultural subgroups to be constructive rather than divisive. One of these students explicitly preferred to teach middle-class children only, but the other three placed no restrictions on their teaching children from low-income families or from different ethnic backgrounds than theirs. Curiously, one student indicated that she preferred not to teach "upper-class" children.

As might be expected, these students acted quite differently about knowledge and curriculum than did conservatively traditional students. All of them recognized that there was agreed upon and public knowledge yet they all acted in their teaching as though their pupils' own experiences would infuse special meanings into an idea and they worked to achieve a synthesis of public and personal knowledge, as when Debbie said,

> A lot of them had just done this geometry stuff and they would see this circle on a piece of paper, this blob, "this is what a square is." They never really thought about the things around them and how they might fit in. So I developed a unit to help them become more aware of the shapes that are part of them, their everyday world. Geometry isn't just on paper; it's everything around us.

All these students were committed to getting productive work from their pupils, but they also aimed to extend their students' powers of thought and insights into how to learn, especially by creating and testing ideas. Joanne commented in an interview,

> I'm trying to make them aware that sometimes there isn't a right or a wrong and that if you are going to take a stand on something you need something concrete to base your stand on.

Generally, their view is that knowledge is more problematic than certain, that it is grasped more completely when understood in wholes rather than in fragments. A useful strategy for achieving understanding is to relate one activity to another and, where reasonable, to integrate subjects. These students organized their classrooms and taught so as to maximize opportunities for pupils to work and learn with other pupils; children were encouraged to help one another. At the same time, their awareness of the individuality of each pupil and their interest in encouraging pupils to be independent as learners led them to balance an emphasis upon collective work with an emphasis upon individual efforts to achieve.

Relationships between teachers and children were warm and personal except for Joanne who tended to stand back from the pupils in her class. All of these students tried to encourage children to act independently and to take responsibility for their own learning by making choices about when and where they would work, as well as with whom. All provided some time during the semester when students played a major role in deciding the topics they would study and the way in which they would study them. These students rejected a bureaucratic view of the teacher's role. They chose instead to interpret and adapt the content of the curriculum, at times creating curriculum units which were quite different from anything the cooperating teacher would otherwise have done. Similarly, they made decisions about teaching strategy and acted toward

institutional authority as though it, too, was not inviolable but was to be interpreted and adapted to suit the exigencies of the classroom's need as interpreted by the teacher. All agreed that parents should be informed about classroom activities and be allowed to visit classrooms but expected that access to be limited and restricted rather than unrestrictedly open. They had similar responses to the possibility that parents should participate in running the school, hiring teachers, or otherwise controlling what happened in the classrooms, rejecting such a possibility and opting instead that such matters be left to professionals. There was no such agreement on the kind of involvement which parents and other community people should have in terms of participation in instruction and creating the content of the curriculum. Two of the students felt that parents should play a very active role and they used parents and community people as instructors in their classrooms. The other two felt that parents should be used sparingly in such roles and should play a passive rather than an active part. While all of them tended to see the source of their teaching problems to be in the classroom or in the school rather than in economic, social, or political conditions of the society, two of them believed that solutions would come from educational interventions aimed at individual children (for example, educating each child to his or her fullest potential) while the other two saw the need for structural changes in the school in addition to efforts to help individuals, and to help them in part by creating a classroom community that was accepting and supportive of a wide range of individual differences.

Instrumental/Pragmatic Perspectives

Students of whatever perspective faced contradictions in their teaching. They were often drawn to competing actions, e.g., being friendly and setting limits including punishing misbehavior. They were often unable to be the kind of teacher they wanted to be because they simply lacked the skill to act the way they wanted to as teachers. Those contradictions within a perspective tended to create a dynamic for action. With conservatively traditional students there was usually a search for a correct technique. With progressive students there was more likely to be a reexamination of belief, usually leading to re-affirmation. For both there was usually an attempt, not necessarily successful, to bring idea and behavior closer together.

The four students with instrumental/pragmatic perspectives were often immobilized by the contradictions they faced and they didn't probe them too deeply. Two of these students identified severe institutional constraints that they believed prevented them from teaching as they wished, although they subverted those constraints at times. Laura taught in a school with a highly routinized curriculum, where teachers were expected to control pupils closely in order to achieve uniform behavior. On a few instances she implemented a diversified curriculum plan, managing several small groups, each working at a different task. She balked at keeping to a prescribed pace in teaching math, when signals from pupils indicated that they did not understand what had been taught earlier. The other student, Marilyn, taught pupils of Hispanic background who were withdrawn from their regular classrooms for short periods for special help in reading and math. She taught

lessons which separated reading and math from other subjects and often from any functional use they might have. She accepted the value that improved reading and math skills would have for her pupils, but she also recognized that they were missing out on significant dimensions of learning that an integrated curriculum would provide. She planned and implemented a more integrated unit during one week in the semester when she was in complete charge of the class. Most of her class time was spent in implementing the existing curriculum, although she rejected its fragmented character. Marilyn appeared to accept the extreme product orientation of her curriculum, pushing her students to complete task after task as quickly as possible and keeping them closely on-task because, as she said, they were already behind other children their age and needed to work especially hard to catch up.

Observed classroom behavior of these four students revealed teaching styles that were very much like those of conservatively traditional students. All of them, even Marilyn, emphasized the public rather than the personal quality of knowledge and the certainty of the knowledge to be learned by their pupils. They taught a fragmented curriculum whose parts were generally separated one from the other. They were less like the conservatively traditional students in their perspectives toward teacher role. They agreed that others could appropriately decide what they should teach. However, all of them decided the way in which they would present ideas to their pupils and in one way or another they tended to interpret rather than merely acquiesce in rules which aimed to regulate the behavior of teachers. These responses were much more like those of progressive teachers than

they were like those of conservatively traditional teachers. In their responses to teacher-pupil relations there was the greatest degree of variety among the four students. Riley never seemed to get personally involved with the pupils in her classroom, but the other three students in this group worked very closely and in a very personal way with their pupils. Riley was different from the others in placing relatively few constraints that would control the learning of her pupils, while the other students in this group tried to direct and channel pupils' learning along predetermined paths. Three of the students permitted a wide range of behavioral responses from children. With the exception of Laura, they often ignored misbehavior as long as it was not disruptive or if it did not directly challenge their authority. Possibly because of the social context in which she taught and the insistence of her cooperating teachers, Laura was very demanding of pupil attention and obedience within the classroom. Outside the class she operated with much looser standards, as when she found children smoking in secret. Although she indicated that she did not think smoking was a good idea, she carefully avoided getting any of them in trouble by reporting their behavior to school authorities. Later, she justified her action by indicating that children would eventually choose for themselves how to act; preaching was likely to encourage the wrong choices. All of these students agreed that parents and community members should have ready access to schools but play very little role in determining how schools should be run, with those responsibilities reserved to professional people. Two of the students saw active roles in instruction as being appropriate for people in the

community, while two of them felt that parents and other community members should play passive, more limited roles as instructors. Marilyn was the only student in this group who believed that the source of some of the problems which teachers found in schools were the result of economic, social, or political conditions of the society. She believed solutions would come only with structural changes either in the school or in the society. The other students saw classroom problems mainly as the result of narrowly educational difficulties rather than of broader social conditions. They located solutions in educational interventions aimed at improving the achievement of individual children.

As a group, these students were like conservatively traditional students in being somewhat more controlling toward pupils' learning and behavior than were progressive students. They were even more like conservatively traditional students in their perspectives toward classroom knowledge and the curriculum. Where they differed from that group was in their less constraining perspectives toward teacher roles, expecting individual teachers to take initiative and counteract institutional forms or constraints that they believed were not in the best interests of their pupils.

The two perspectives "conservatively traditional" and "progressive" are not mutually exclusive nor are they at opposite ends of a single continuum. There are important areas of overlap and agreement between them as well as variety in the choices for action by students who place themselves generally within each perspective.

We can only speculate about the assumptions underlying any of these perspectives toward teaching. Students of the first two types seemed to echo in their choices the political philosophies which we used as labels--conservatively traditional, progressive. Students in the third group seemed to choose actions that did not fit together comfortably when seen as abstractions but which created workable and, for two of them at least, bearable teaching conditions. Whether their choices represent incomplete or partially formed perspectives or whether they identify a different way to resolve the conflicting appeals of situational dilemmas is not entirely clear, given the data we have about them at this time. We explore more fully the political and social dimensions of their choices in the next section.

The Role of Student Teaching

As mentioned previously, there is currently a great deal of debate in the literature over whether student teaching plays a significant role in the development of teachers. On the one hand, some like Lortie (1975) argue that student teaching plays little part in altering the perspectives that students bring to the experience. On the other hand, some like Hoy and Rees (1977) contend that student teaching exerts a powerful and homogenizing influence on the perspectives brought to the experience and that teacher perspectives become increasingly similar as prospective teachers begin to confront the institutional context of the school during their early years of teaching. This section will address the following questions in relation to the data of the present study: (1) What changes in perspective occurred during the 15-week student teaching experience? (2) What was the relative contribution of the psychological context (e.g., teachers' implicit theories and intentions) and the social context (especially external resources and institutional constraints) to the development of student teacher perspectives?

First, our data clearly indicate that student teaching did not result in a homogenization of teacher perspectives. Students came into the experience with different perspectives on teaching and significant differences among students remained at the end of the semester. The description of the perspectives of the 13 student teachers in the previous section indicates among other things that the typical focus

in the student teaching literature on one dominant perspective is misguided. Dichotomous classifications seldom account for exceptions to the two major groups and rarely describe the variety of difference within each perspective.

The existence of diverse perspectives at the end of the experience, however, does not address by itself the question of potency of impact. Conceivably, students could have entered the experience with diverse perspectives and then shifted in response to the diverse perspectives of their supervisors and the norms existent in their school placements. The diversity which existed at the end of the experience could in fact reflect a powerful shaping influence of institutional imperatives on relatively malleable student teachers. The issue of the homogenization of perspectives and the question of potency of impact need to be examined separately.

With regard to the question of the strength of the impact of student teaching, our analyses of the pre and post TBI scores, interviews and observations with students, and interviews with cooperating teachers and university supervisors overwhelmingly indicate that student teaching did not significantly alter the substance of the teaching perspectives that students brought to the experience. On the contrary, with the exception of three students, teaching perspectives developed but did not fundamentally change over the course of the 15-week semester. For the most part, students became more articulate in expressing and more skillful in implementing the perspectives which they possessed in less developed forms at the beginning of the experience.

The following description by one university supervisor of the development of one of her students is typical of the perceptions of both university supervisors and cooperating teachers regarding changes in perspectives:

> I felt that she pretty much had her mind made up as to what she was going to do, how she was going to do things, and what she believed in. She was open to suggestions, but I felt she already had a pretty well established teacher identity. Her experience more or less solidified for her what she had already found out. [Interview with Ellen's supervisor]

Also, the following comment from one of the 13 students when asked to reflect back on her development during the semester represents the perceptions of most of the students:

> I can't think of anything that radically changed. I think I was always leaning towards it, and this semester just made my position more comfortable--made me much more aware of what my teaching style was. I didn't change in any major ways. [Interview with Grace]

As we analyzed and reanalyzed the perceptions of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and student teachers, and our own observations and interviews with students regarding the issue of continuity/discontinuity, it became increasingly clear that the dominant trend was for teaching perspectives to develop and grow in a direction consistent with the latent culture that students brought to the experience. However, there were a few instances where comments contradicted our general conclusion concerning continuity in perspectives. Following are three examples of student and supervisor perceptions of changes that occurred during student teaching. First, one student teacher, in reflecting upon her own development, stated:

> I came in here with a lot of doubts. The way it was set up was so different, I thought it couldn't work. Well, it does work. It's real effective, I think, after seeing the results with kids. . . . I don't think I was all that firm-footed in the beginning. I was open to lots of suggestions. I needed them! [Interview with Marilyn]

Secondly, another student teacher, in reflecting upon changes in her relationships with children, stated:

> I've become a lot more affectionate toward the kids. I give 'em a hug or hang on to them when they ask me questions. Now they're always hopping on my lap while we're talking about their problems in math or something. And that's something I've never done before. I've always felt close to the kids but I think a lot of it was just that my teachers were a lot more inhibited. They didn't show their feelings or maybe they just didn't have the same feelings. . . . I'm a very affectionate person, but I think as far as showing it in the classroom I always felt kind of funny about it. [Interview with Debbie]

Finally, a university supervisor, reflecting on the development of one of his students, indicated:

> I think that the most significant change during the semester was that by the end of the time she allowed much more input from the students into the curriculum. She gave them, it seemed to me, a meaningful role in the process; much more so than at the beginning. [Interview with Grace's supervisor]

On the surface, these examples and others like them would seem to indicate that there were substantive changes in the perspectives of student teachers. However, it is our belief after carefully examining data on these and other alleged changes from four different viewpoints that the seeds of these developments were present at the beginning of the experience. For example, Debbie did in fact become more openly affectionate with her pupils over the course of the 15 weeks, but from the very beginning of the semester, she demonstrated

a tendency to attempt to establish warm and personal relationships with children. According to one of her cooperating teachers, her sensitivity and respect for children as human beings were present from the moment she walked into the classroom in January (interview with one of Debbie's cooperating teachers). The same basic continuity is the case with regard to Marilyn's acceptance of her cooperating teacher's individualized approach to curricular planning and for Grace's attempts to involve children in the development of instructional activities.

In fact, in Debbie's case she was faced with a situation where two of her three cooperating teachers held very different perspectives with regard to the dimension of "distant-personal" teacher-pupil relationships. For Debbie, one cooperating teacher seemed cold and distant, leaving her with an adverse reaction, while she appreciated and enjoyed the affection and warmth toward children that flowed from the other cooperating teacher. It was a combination of her own initial tendencies and the reactions that she saw from children when she acted on those tendencies, that resulted in her development along the lines of the more "personally-oriented" cooperating teacher. The opportunity was present for her to legitimately move in either direction.

> I guess as far as my trying to show kids that I cared about them, I did that as kind of an adverse reaction to Libby [one of her cooperating teachers]. When I watched her with the reading group that I had, she was just very strict—this is the way you do it, rather methodical. And it didn't seem caring. . . she didn't show them any affection. And I saw that when I got them and when I was more caring with them, I thought the strides they made were just unbelievable. I saw such different ways of teaching between the way she did it and the way I did it. And so by seeing how little they did for her really ingrained in me that

> if you're caring, understanding, and you're interested in the kids, no matter who they are, then they're more caring, understanding, and wanna be nice to you and work hard. [Interview with Debbie]

Despite the lack of significant shifts in the substance of student teacher perspectives that would have caused us to alter our placement of students into particular groups, there were several kinds of changes that did occur for most students. Generally, students came into the experience with fairly well defined "proto-perspectives" ready to be developed but typically lacked confidence and often the skill to implement effectively their preferred pedagogies. Furthermore, although students came into student teaching with a background of two pre-student-teaching practicums, they had not spent full and consecutive days in a school since their own pupilhood and had mostly concentrated in the past on the teaching of discrete lessons to individual children and small groups. Finally, there was the added dimension of needing to make a favorable impression on cooperating teachers and supervisors which resulted from the inevitable differences between the status of student teacher and teacher. The shift to full-time status in a school that occurred with the onset of student teaching represented a clear break for most students. As one student teacher commented in reference to her boyfriend who was then enrolled in the final practicum prior to student teaching:

> It's interesting just to see his naiveness, because he is where I was last semester. He may think he knows a lot and he does, but until you're in the full-time and you're working with the students as a full-time teacher, there are so many things you don't see about teaching. [Interview with Ellen]

For most students this shift to full-time status in a school resulted in a more realistic perception of the work of teaching and of the teacher's role.

> It seemed all my life that teaching was working with children and that's all there was. That's fine, and I love it, but that's all I could see myself doing as a teacher. But now after seeing it, sure I'm with the class all day, but you're always talking to other teachers in the hall; you're interacting with the school psychologist, the social workers, the principal, the office workers, the cooks, and the librarian. There's just so many people that you interact with. [Interview with Ellen]

> I really found out what it's like to give and give and give, and sometimes you feel that you're getting nothing in return. As a college student you feel like if you put in a lot of work you're going to get a good grade. Here, you go in every day, write all these lesson plans, and give and give. Sometimes you just don't get the satisfaction you want. And that's one of the elements of teaching that I thought would be self-satisfying. [Interview with Karen]

In addition to gaining a more realistic perception of the job of teaching, most student teachers grew increasingly comfortable with their initial positions, more confident in their abilities to handle a classroom in their preferred styles, and increasingly less fearful of the potential threat posed by observations and evaluations of their teaching.

> In the beginning when my supervisor would come in, I would immediately think, "Well, what is he going to think of this activity." But toward the end I just thought, "Well, this is what I am teaching," and I didn't change anything. I kind of felt "this is the way I am and I can't help it if we don't think alike." In the beginning I thought what is he going to expect, and I tried to live up to that, but eventually I decided it's not worth the bother. [Interview with Grace]

Despite the growing confidence of students in themselves as teachers and in their abilities to implement the kind of teaching they preferred, the growing independence from university supervisors expressed above was oftentimes not openly expressed.

> I guess I just sort of humor her by saying, "Yea, yea," rather than getting into a hassle. The reason that I don't say anything to her is because I figure it's just easier. I'll do things my way in the classroom and that's the way it goes. I like to get suggestions from her or anybody else. . . If I feel it's valid, then I'll use it; if not, then I just won't. [Interview with Debbie]

This growing confidence and the development of teaching perspectives in a direction consistent with the latent culture brought to the experience was true for 10 of the 13 students. Colin Lacey's (1977) construct of social strategy is helpful in illuminating this process of growth that occurred for most students and also helps us to understand the motives and actions of the three students who did not fit this dominant pattern.[2]

Lacey (1977, pp. 67-68) defines a social strategy as the purposeful selection of ideas and actions by prospective teachers and the working out of their interrelationships in specific situations. He then identifies three distinct strategies that he claims are employed by prospective teachers in the face of institutional constraints. First, internalized adjustment refers to a response where individuals comply with the authority figure's definition of a situation and believe these constraints to be for the best. This strategy indicates those situations where an individual willingly develops into the kind of person the situation demands and socialization entails both behavioral conformity and value commitment.

On the other hand, strategic compliance refers to those instances where individuals comply with the constraints posed by a situation, but retain private reservations about doing so. This strategy implies that individuals do not act in ways consistent with their underlying beliefs and conformity is essentially an adaptive response without the corresponding value basis on which the behavior presumably rests. Finally, the strategy of strategic redefinition refers to those situations where change is brought about by individuals who do not possess the formal power to do so. These individuals widen the range of acceptable behaviors in a situation and introduce new and creative elements into a social setting.

These social strategies identified by Lacey are heuristic for the purposes of understanding the development of student teachers in the present study. First, it should be pointed out that all of the student teachers engaged in each of these social strategies at various times during the semester and in relation to particular aspects of their experiences. All students maintained internal doubts about some of their actions during the semester and all students were fully committed to other aspects of their experiences. Finally, all students engaged in some form of strategic redefinition during the semester and introduced new and creative elements into their classrooms. Acknowledging the variety of social strategies that were employed by each student teacher, we will now examine the dominant responses of each student to their student teaching situation. For despite the variety of strategies employed by individual students, there was clearly a modal strategy that characterized the actions of each student.

First, as is indicated above, most student teachers (10 of 13) were able to develop their perspectives in ways consistent with their initial inclinations. This group of students, which includes individuals from each of the three teaching perspectives, generally found themselves in situations where they were in basic agreement with the norms of their classrooms and the perspectives of their cooperating teachers. Internalized adjustment was the dominant response of these students to their student teaching situations. Their behavioral conformity was undergirded by a corresponding value commitment.

On the other hand, the three students whose perspectives did not develop during the semester along the lines that would be predicted from the latent cultures that they brought to the experience, employed the strategy of strategic complicance. Each of these individuals reacted strongly against the constraints posed by their placements, but because of the severe nature of the constraints and because of their status as student teachers they generally acted in ways demanded by their situations while maintaining private reservations about doing so.

The frustrations experienced by two of these students (Marilyn and Laura) with regard to strong institutional constraints is illustrated by Marilyn's comments in relation to the limitations posed by her classroom where the curriculum was prescribed to a great degree and where the pupils spent only a portion of each day with her.

> I guess I'm just at a loss as to how I can implement some of my ideas into this program when we are so stressed on teaching reading, reading, reading. They [the pupils] have to stay in the Macmillan series. There is just no time to even be real creative or anything. That's what's frustrating--because you have ideas and you want to try them and there's just no time.

The third student (Karen) did not face the same kinds of strong institutional constraints faced by Marilyn and Laura, but because of a great deal of tension and conflict between her cooperating teacher and university supervisor, Karen expended most of her energies complying with the oftentimes contradictory expections of her supervisors and very little energy acting on her inclinations and instincts:

> When we had three-way conferences, I just wouldn't say that much. I didn't commit myself to either side, 'cause I knew that I wanted a good letter of recommendation. And so if my supervisor would want me to teach a certain lesson, sure I'll teach it. If my cooperating teaching would want me to do things, I did them. I was more subdued than I am around my friends. I'm pretty opinionated. I usually let people know what I think, but this semester I just kind of slaved. [Interview with Karen]

That these three students were resilient in the face of situational constraints and maintained an underlying resistance to many of the actions in which they were forced to participate is illustrated by Marilyn's comments regarding many of the teachers in her school:

> The other teachers in the school--their attitudes really affected my attitudes. Well, they're still trying to label a kid as autistic. He's not autistic--they're off the wall and I don't know why they're doing this. Generally, I was strongly the opposite of what they were believing, and it just strengthened my ideas more and more. [Interview with Marilyn]

Finally, while none of the students adopted strategic redefinition as their dominant response during student teaching, for all of the students there are some examples of the introduction of new content and procedures into their classrooms. The following example refers to Grace's introduction of language experience lessons into a classroom where the dominant approach was to teach reading through basal readers:

> The lowest group, they were working out of a workbook, and that is mainly what Mrs. X does when she calls the kids back. They all take out their workbooks and go over the page and talk about what has to be done on the page. . . . So I just suggested that maybe it would be worthwhile to work on language experience with them and she said it would be fine. [Interview with Grace]

However, despite these instances where students introduced new elements into their classrooms, for the most part they did not challenge the routines of their classrooms and worked within the parameters of what was acceptable behavior in a particular situation. Significantly, what was seen as acceptable behavior in a situation was consistent with the predispositions of students in the majority of cases.

Lacey's notion of social strategy helps bring into focus the important and general question of the relative influence of individual intent and institutional constraint on the perspectives of student teachers.[3] On the one hand, there are some who suggest that student teachers respond in a haphazard fashion to whatever the situation demands and who would deny that individual intentions make any substantial contribution to the perspectives of student teachers (e.g, Schwille et al., 1979). On the other hand, it is our belief after examining the data from the present study that individual intentions do matter (at least during student teaching) and that the classroom actions of student teachers are a result of a continual interplay between the intentions of individuals and institutional constraints. The actions of student teachers are not totally determined by the perspectives brought to the experience; nor are they totally determined by institutional imperatives. Both the individuals and the social situation affected the development of perspectives. However, because the dominance of

internalized adjustment in the present study does not necessarily demonstrate the resilience of student teachers in the fact of institutional constraints and in fact could be used in support of the contrary position, it becomes necessary to provide evidence in addition to the three cases of strategic compliance for our view of student teacher socialization as an interactive process.[4]

There are several different kinds of evidence in our data which would lend support to our view of student teacher socialization and which would confirm the significance of individual intent which is inherent in Lacey's notion of social strategy. First of all, the student teachers in this particular program actively participated in the selection of their student teaching placements. During the semester prior to their student teaching, each student observed and talked with at least two potential cooperating teachers. These observations and discussions took place after an interview with university personnel which attempted to provide students with classrooms to observe that closely matched their expressed preferences. Student teachers and cooperating teachers were required to reach a mutual agreement regarding a "match" before a placement was finalized, and several of the 13 students observed and talked with at least four teachers before obtaining a placement.

Consequently, for the most part students selected themselves into situations that would enable them to develop in the directions they desired and many students rejected placements that did not offer them this opportunity. The only exceptions to this trend were the three students whose dominant response was one of strategic compliance. Laura selected her placement largely because it was one of the few paid

placements available in the program, and Marilyn chose her bilingual placement because the maintenance oriented and self-contained program that she desired was not available. In Karen's case the conflicts that resulted from the very different perspectives of her two supervisors reduced the significance of her role in selecting a placement and prevented her from actively asserting herself during the experience.

Secondly, as students talked with both teachers and university personnel regarding their preferences for a classroom placement their experiences in two previous practicums helped give some direction to this process of identifying a classroom for student teaching. There is a lot of evidence in our data that most students consciously thought about their previous field experiences during this process and purposefully selected themselves into particular kinds of settings.

> Last semester I was in a fifth grade class where the teacher was, well, he thought that children learned best if they were in their seats and quiet. You go through every book page by page, answer all of the questions and take all of the standardized tests. . . . I guess I got to see that kids couldn't take it, and I couldn't take it, being so structured. I wanted a classroom this semester where kids were more free to do what they want and where a lot of the materials come from me or from a resource. [Interview with Debbie]

Also, as was the case in Lortie's (1975) study of inservice teachers, there were several instances in our data where student teachers spontaneously referred to their own experiences as pupils when providing justifications for particular beliefs and classroom actions, an occurrence which lends further support to the significance of students' biographies.

> I had this when I was little [making a "me" book] and I still have the book. It was the best thing that I

> ever did in school. So I just wanted to do it with my kids. I copied the idea right off what my teacher did with me. [Interview with Sarah]

Finally, as was illustrated above by Debbie's conscious rejection of the model for relating to children that was provided by one of her cooperating teachers, in each case where the dominant response to a situation was one of internalized adjustment, there was also evidence that students were able to give some direction to the specific form of this adjustment. For example, Egan's (1982) case study analysis of three of the 13 students demonstrates how diverse perspectives were allowed to exist in the same school. Despite the common and relatively strong institutional constraints shared by these students and their general strategy of internalized constraint, these three students were still able to respond to their situations in somewhat unique ways.

In summary, it is our belief that individual intention and institutional constraint both played significant roles in affecting the development of student teacher perspectives in the present study. Despite the fact that only three students strategically complied with the demands posed by their situations and although none of the students significantly redefined the range of acceptable behaviors in the classrooms, the majority of student teachers purposefully selected themselves into situations where they would be able to act in certain ways and reacted somewhat uniquely to their situations even in the fact of common institutional constraints. There is little evidence in our data that would support the kind of passive response to institutional forces that is frequently suggested in the literature, nor an unthinking acquiescence to institutional demands.

Finally, despite our claims concerning the interactive nature of occupational socialization during student teaching,[5] the question could and should be raised as to why one should bother with identifying the perspectives of student teachers. Even though one might accept our conclusions regarding the resilience of student teachers in the face of institutional constraints in the case of those students who strategically complied and our arguments concerning the significance of individual intent even in those instances where intent closely matched the demands posed by the situation, the argument could still be made that the perspectives of student teachers will inevitably be "washed out" anyway during the early years of a teaching career. The question of the role of student teaching in the development of teachers (i.e., Do student teacher perspectives matter in the long run?) cannot be adequately answered by the present study.

Presently, we are conducting an intensive follow-up study with four of the 13 students during their first year of teaching. Significantly, these individuals are now teachers and not student teachers and had far less input into the selection of their teaching positions than was the case for their student teaching placements. Each of these teachers is also working within an institutional context very different from the one that existed during their student teaching. We are currently spending a minimum of three full weeks with each teacher (spread over the year) and are attempting to understand how the teaching perspectives that these individuals held at the end of their preservice training are strengthened or modified during their first year of employment.

Currently, there is a great deal of sentiment in our field regarding the vulnerability of first-year teachers to the press of institutional forces. As we have argued elsewhere (Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981), we take exception to this position and feel that the nature of the relationship between student teacher perspectives and those held as first-year teachers is not well understood.[6] In the final analysis, it will only be through such longitudinal studies[7] that trace the development of student teacher perspectives into teachers' careers that the role of student teaching will be better understood.

NOTES

[1]This interpretation of teacher perspectives as including both actions and ideas is also consistent with the studies of Gibson (1976), Janesick (1978), and Sharp and Green (1975).

[2]Rosow (1965) has developed a classification scheme which is highly similar to Lacey's to describe the somewhat more general processes of adult socialization.

[3]This paper will only discuss the broad question of the role of institutional constraint and individual intent in the socialization of student teachers. The important and somewhat more specific question of the relative contribution of the university and schools to the development of teacher perspectives during student teaching will be discussed in a separate paper.

[4]The argument could be made that the existence of strategic compliance provides little support for the claim that individual intent was significant. After all, both the "strategic compliers" and "internalized adjustors" acted in ways that were "demanded" by their situations. Both Lacey (1977) and Rosow (1965) address this issue and identify some of the significant differences between the moral commitment associated with internalized adjustment and the essentially utilitarian commitment of "Strategic compliers." They argue, among other things, that the existence of strategic compliance limits the extent of possible consensus in a system and that given a situation where institutional constraints are relaxed, "Strategic compliers"

are likely to act in a manner more consistent with their value commitments. There is one instance of support for this position in the present study. Marilyn, during her two-week period of "lead teaching," was given substantially more control over classroom instruction than either before or afterwards. During this two-week period Marilyn's behavior changed markedly and was far more consistent with her underlying ideology. This relaxation of institutional constraints did not occur for the other two students who strategically complied, Laura and Karen.

[5]It could be argued that the interactive nature of student teacher socialization in the present study was largely an artifact of the condition where students were allowed to purposefully select themselves into particular kinds of situations and/or of the fact that student teaching in this program was not the first exposure that students had to fieldwork. In programs where students have little input into determining their placements and/or in programs where student teaching is the first and often only exposure of students to fieldwork, one might predict a somewhat different outcome. If we are correct, however, about the significance of both individual intent and institutional constraint, then in programs where students have little input into the selection of placements for instance, one would expect more cases of strategic compliance. In any case, testing out the inferences which we have drawn from the data of the present study in different program contexts and with different students would shed further light on the validity and generalizability of our claims.

It should also be recalled that in the present study we have made no claim to have investigated the full range of student teachers' perspectives. It could be the case that there are other dimensions of perspectives not investigated in the present study that would alter the patterns of perspectives described earlier and which would lead to a reinterpretation of the socialization mechanisms that appeared to operate in the present study. In any case, despite an N of only 13 and several possibly idiosyncratic features of the program studied, our interpretation does support the empirical findings of Lacey's (1977) study and several similar studies on the processes of occupational socialization in other fields (e.g., Olesen and Whittaker, 1968).

[6]The existence of diverse teaching perspectives in the same school which has been documented by those such as Carew and Lightfoot (1979) and Metz (1978) lends support to our position that the effects of preservice teacher education are not necessarily "washed out" by school experience and underscores the need for further research on this question.

[7]Studies are also needed which follow student teachers from a point prior to student teaching (e.g., during early field experiences) into the early years of teaching. Unfortunately, our resources in the present study did not permit such an investigation.

References

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Barr, R., & Duffy, G. Teachers' conceptions of reading: The evolution of a research study. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching (Research Series No. 17), July 1978.

Bartholomew J. Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1976.

Becker, H., Geer, B., Hughes E., & Strauss, A. Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bennett, N. Teaching styles and pupil progress. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Berger, P., & Luckman, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday, 1967.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. Dilemmas of schooling: Teaching and social change. London: Methuen, 1981.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. Federal programs supporting educational change, Volume III: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Washington, D. C.: USOE/HEW, May 1978.

Bucher, R., & Stelling, J. Becoming professional. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1977.

Bussis, A., Chittenden, E., & Amarel, M. Beyond surface curriculum. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1976.

Carew, J., & Lightfoot, S. L. Beyond bias: Perspectives on classrooms. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Copeland, W. Student teachers and cooperating teachers: An ecological relationship. Theory into Practice, 1980, 18, 194-199.

Dale, R. Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching. In D. Gleason (Ed.), Identity and structure: Issues in the sociology of education. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books, 1977).

Egan, K. B. The power of personal context in making students teachers: Three cases. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.

Gibson, R. The effects of school practice: The development of student perspectives. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1976, 2, 241-50.

Gracey, H. Curriculum or craftsmanship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Hammersley, M. Teacher perspectives. Milton Keynes, England: The Open University Press, 1977.

Haslam, M. An analysis of the development of perspectives toward teaching among student teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1971.

Hoy, W., & Rees, W. The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 23-26.

Iannaccone, L. Student teaching: A transitional stage on the making of a teacher. Theory into Practice, 1963, 2, 73-80

Janesick, V. An ethnographic study of a teacher's classroom perspective. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 33, 1978.

Keddie N. Classroom knowledge. In M. Young (Ed.), Knowledge and control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Lacey C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.

LeCompte, M. Learning to work: The hidden curriculum of the classroom. Anthropology and Education, 1978, 9, 22-37.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Maddox, H. A descriptive study of teaching practice. Educational Review, 1968, 20, 177-180.

Mardle, G., & Walker, M. Strategies and structure: Critical notes on teacher socialization. In Peter Woods (Ed.), Teacher strategies: Explorations in the sociology of the school. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

Mead, G. H. The philosophy of the act. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Metz, M. Classrooms and corridors. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1978.

Oleson, V., & Whittaker, E. The silent dialogue. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Petty, M., & Hogben, D. Explorations of semantic space with beginning teachers: A study of socialization into teaching. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 6, 51-61.

Popkewitz, T. Teacher education: Ideology or social mission? A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B. R., & Wehlage, G. The myth of educational reform. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Romberg, T., & Fox, G. T. Problems in analyzing dynamic events in teacher education. Madison, Wisconsin: USOE/Teacher Corps, September, 1976.

Rosow, I. Forms and functions of adult socialization. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 35-45.

Schwille, J. et al. Factors influencing teachers' decisions about what to teach. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Research Series No. 62, 1979.

Sharp, R., & Green, A. Education and social control. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Shavelson, R., & Stern, P. Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 1981, 51, 455-498.

Stake, R., & Easley, J. Case studies in science education (Volume 2). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office (No. 038-000-00376-3).

Stephens, J. The processes of schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Tabachnick, B. R., Popkewitz, T., & Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of student teachers. Interchange, 1979-80, 10, 12-29.

Tabachnick, B. R., Zeichner, K., Densmore, K., Adler, S., Egan, K., & Hudak, G. The development of teacher perspectives and the relationships among teacher perspectives, school and classroom processes, and student diversity. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, in progress.

Wright, B., & Tuska, S. The childhood romance theory of teacher development. School Review, 1967, 75, 123-154.

Yee, A. Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 327-332.

Zeichner, K. Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31, 45-55.

Zeichner, K., & Grant, C. Biography and social structure in the socialization of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1981, 1, 298-314.

Zeichner, K., & Tabachnick, B. R. Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32, 7-11.

APPENDIX A

ELEMENTS OF TEACHER PERSPECTIVES

Elements of Teacher Perspectives

Following are the definitions for each of the 23 elements that were used to define the perspectives of the 13 student teachers. As was indicated earlier, some of these elements reflect additions and/or changes that were made to our framework as we proceeded to test our original framework against the data that we were gathering and other elements were dropped from our initial framework during the process of data analysis. If an element was also utilized by Berlak and Berlak (1981) and/or Hammersley (1977) this fact is noted in parentheses at the end of the description of the element. Table 1 which follows the definitions of the elements summarizes the range that existed on each of the elements among the 13 students in our sample.

Knowledge and Curriculum

1. Public Knowledge--Personal Knowledge

On the one hand, an emphasis on public knowledge indicates a view that school knowledge consists primarily of accumulated bodies of information, skills, facts, etc. which exist external to and independent of the learner. On the other hand, an emphasis on personal knowledge indicates a view that the value of school knowledge is established primarily through its relationship to the learner. Implicit in this position is the view that school knowledge is useful and significant only insofar as it enables persons to make sense of their experience.

What is at issue here is the clarity of the distinction that the teacher makes between public knowledge on the one hand and

pupils' everyday knowledge on the other. To what degree is students' personal knowledge ruled out as irrelevant in the teacher's definition of the school curriculum? To what degree does the teacher allow or even encourage children's interests, background experiences, etc. to contribute to the school curriculum? Our students ranged from a dominant concern with knowledge is public to a middle position where there was a legitimate concern for both public and personal knowledge. None of our students indicated a dominant concern for knowledge is personal. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

2. Knowledge is Product--Knowledge is Process

An emphasis on knowledge as product indicates a view of school knowledge as organized bodies of information, facts, theories, etc., and the evaluation of pupil learning is seen as a question of conformity to or deviance from specifications laid down the the teacher (e.g., the "correct" answer). The process by which the answer is reached is regarded as relatively unproblematic. Here there is a concern for the reproduction of an answer by whatever means. On the other hand, a knowledge as process emphasis indicates a concern with the thinking and reasoning underlying the production of a product and this thinking process is viewed as a way of establishing the truth or validity of a body of content. The central issue here is whether mastery of content or substance takes priority over the mastery of skills of thinking and reasoning. Our students ranged from a dominant concern with knowledge as product to a middle position where there was a legitimate concern for both process and product. None of the 13 students demonstrated a dominant concern for knowledge as process. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

3. Knowledge is Certain--Knowledge is Problematic

An emphasis on knowledge as certain indicates an approach to school knowledge as truth "out there" to be uncritically accepted by children. On the other hand, where the emphasis is on knowledge as problematic, school knowledge is treated as constructed, tentative, and subject to social, political, and cultural influences. Here there is a concern with developing children's creative and critical abilities. Our students ranged from those whose dominant concern was with knowledge as certain to those who adopted a middle position where there was a legitimate concern for and synthesis of knowledge as certain-problematic. None of the 13 students demonstrated a dominant concern for knowledge as problematic. (Berlak & Berlak)

4. Learning is Fragmented--Learning is Holistic

An emphasis on learning is fragmented indicates a view that learning is the accumulation of discrete parts or pieces; when one has mastered the pieces, one "knows" the whole. There is little concern that the parts be seen in relationship to the whole either before, during, or after the learning experience. From the learning is holistic perspective, the understanding of a whole is sought and is seen as a process that is something more than the learning of a series of parts. Learning is seen as the active construction of meaning by persons and opportunities are provided for pupils to mentally act upon the material and to relate it to something already known. Both of these perspectives existed within the group of 13 students. (Berlak & Berlak)

5. Learning is Unrelated--Learning is Integrated

This element is concerned with the degree to which teachers view school knowledge as compartmentalized within specific disciplines or content areas (unrelated) or the degree to which the boundaries between content areas are blurred (integrated). An integrated curricular emphasis would indicate that the teacher has made efforts to subordinate previously insulated subject areas to some relational idea or theme. Both of these perspectives existed within the group of 13 students. (Hammersley)

6. Learning is a Collective--Individual Activity

From the perspective of learning is an individual activity, learning proceeds best as an individual encounter between the child and material or between the child and teacher. Learning is seen as a function of each individual child's particular capabilities and/or motivation. On the other hand, an emphasis on learning as a collective activity indicates a view that learning proceeds best when ideas are exchanged in a cooperative and supportive setting where one person can test out his/her ideas against those of others. There is thought to be a construction of meaning by the community of learners that goes beyond what can be gained by individual encounters with materials and with teachers. Our students ranged from those who demonstrated a dominant concern for learning as an individual activity to those who adopted a middle position where there was a legitimate concern for both learning as an individual and a collective activity. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

7. Teacher-Pupil Control over Pupil Learning: High--Low

The question here is the degree of control that the teacher versus pupils exert over such aspects of learning as when pupils are to begin an activity, how long they are to work at a particular task, how pupils are to perform the tasks, and criteria by which student work is evaluated. Both of these perspectives existed among our group of 13 students. (Berlak & Berlak: Hammersley)

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant--Personal Teacher-Pupil Relationships

A distant orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to maintain relatively detached and formal relationships with children, to maintain "a guarded professional face." On the other hand, a personal orientation to teacher-pupil relationships indicates a desire to establish close, informal, and honest relationships with children. Here the teacher is observed interacting with pupils about matters other than schoolwork, and "participates" with pupils rather than remaining detached. Both of these perspectives existed among the 13 students. (Berlak & Berlak)

9. Teacher vs Pupil Control over Pupil Behavior: High--Low

On the one hand, high control over pupil behavior indicates that the teacher makes many explicit rules for governing a wide range of pupil behavior. On the other hand, low control over pupil behavior indicates that children are asked to assume a great deal of responsibility for their behavior. There are not many explicit rules, and those that do exist are relatively ambiguous and/or narrow in scope. Both of these perspectives existed among our group of 13 students. (Hammersley)

The Teacher's Role

10. The Teacher's Role: What to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding what to teach in relation to institutional requirements of schools and/or school districts. On the one hand, a bureaucratic response indicates that the teacher generally follows with little question the school curriculum that is prescribed by a school or school district. Here the teacher feels that it is inappropriate to alter that content which is prescribed from above, and the teacher recognizes the legitimate role of the institution to dictate practically all of the content of the school curriculum. On the other hand, a functional response indicates that there is evidence that the teacher adapts and interprets prescribed content for use in their particular situation. Finally, an independent response indicates that a teacher shows evidence of activity constructing curricular content independent of any institutional directives. Here teachers may even ignore institutional directives and substitute content that they and/or the children have decided to address. Our students ranged from those who sought out and accepted practically all institutional directives regarding what to teach to those who showed evidence of adapting prescribed content to particular circumstances. None of the students utilized a substantial degree of personal discretion in deciding what would be taught in their classrooms.

11. The Teacher's Role: How to Teach.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role regarding methods of instruction and is concerned with the degree of personal discretion utilized by teachers in determining the processes of their lessons. Bureaucratic, functional, and independent responses are defined as in the preceding element. Our students ranged from those who adopted a bureaucratic response to those who adopted a functional response. None of the students exerted a great deal of discretion in determining the form of instruction.

12. The Teacher's Role: School Rules and Regulations.
Bureaucratic--Functional--Independent

This element addresses the teacher's conception of his/her role in relation to school rules and regulations. A bureaucratic, functional, and independent response are defined as above. Our students ranged from those who followed institutional directives without question to those who selectively applied rules and regulations to their particular circumstances. None of the students demonstrated a substantial degree of independence from institutional rules and regulations.

The Role of the Community in School Affairs

13. Community Access to Schools: Limited Access--Free Access

Should parents be kept informed about classroom activities, be allowed, or even encouraged, to visit classrooms, etc. All of our students felt that parents should have relatively free access to schools and classrooms.

14. Community Involvement in Curriculum and Instruction: Passive Role--Active Role

Should parents have input into the content of the curriculum and methods of instruction? Does the teacher see a role for community people and/or community resources as "instructors" in the classroom? Some of our students wanted parents to play active roles in this area while others felt that parents' roles should be limited.

15. Community Involvement in School Administration: No Role--Active Role

Does the teacher feel that parents should participate in the running of the school (e.g., hiring teachers), or should these matters be left to "professionals"? None of our students felt that parents should play active roles in administering the school.

The School and Society

16. The Source of the Teacher's Problems: Individualistic--Sociopolitical

Here the question is concerned with whether a teacher locates the source of the teacher's problems primarily in the characteristics of individual students and their families (e.g., motivation, ability, home background) or whether the teacher in addition sees structural aspects of schools and the social, economic, and

political characteristics of the society as significant contributors to the teacher's problematic. Our students ranged from those who located all problems in individual students and their families (individualistic perspective) to those who identified relationships between structural dynamics within and beyond the school to classroom problems.

17. Solutions to the Teacher's Problems: Educational Interventions--Structural Interventions in the School and Society

Here the question is whether the teacher sees the solutions to his/her problems as lying within the realm of educational interventions only (e.g., educating each child to his/her fullest potential) and within an educational and social context that is taken for granted, or whether the teacher sees the need for structural interventions (by teachers) in the school and/or society in addition to those actions aimed at individual children. Both of these perspectives existed within the group of 13 students.

Student Diversity

18. Children as Unique--Children as Members of a Category

This dimension focuses on the degree to which teachers think about children as alike (a focus on shared characteristics) or in terms of a unique mix of many dimensions. How many and what kinds of categories does the teacher use to draw distinctions among children and how differentiated are the various categories? Our students ranged from those who made very complex differentiations among children to those who thought about and related to children within broad categories. (Berlak & Berlak)

19. Universalism--Particularism: School Curriculum

A universalistic position would indicate a belief that all children should be exposed to the same curriculum either at the same time or at a different pace. On the other hand, a particularistic response indicates that a teacher feels and acts in a way that indicates a concern that there are some elements of the curriculum that should be offered to only certain individuals or groups of children. Both of these perspectives existed among the 13 students. (Hammersley)

20. Universalism--Particularism: Student Behavior

A universalistic position indicates a situation where the same rules for behavior are applied to all students (e.g., uniform sanctions for the same transgressions). A particularistic position indicates a situation where rules for behavior are applied somewhat differentially. Here when the teacher applies rules for behavior he/she takes into account individual student characteristics such as age, ability, home background, etc. Both of these perspectives existed among the 13 students. (Berlak & Berlak; Hammersley)

21. Allocation of School/Teacher Resources: Equal--Differential

On the one hand, some teachers take the position that all students deserve an equal share (in terms of both quantity and quality) of school resources such as teacher time, materials, and knowledge. On the other hand, some teachers hold the view that some individual students or groups of students merit a greater share of resources than others. This element addresses

the question of distributive justice in the classroom. Both of these perspectives existed among the group of 13 students. Berlak & Berlak)

22. Common Culture--Subgroup Consciousness

A common culture emphasis indicates a desire to develop in children a common set of values, norms, and social definitions. On the other hand, a subgroup consciousness emphasis indicates a desire to foster in children a greater awareness of themselves as a member of some subgroup distinguished from others by such factors as language, race, ethnicity, etc. Both of these perspectives existed within our group of 13 students. (Berlak & Berlak)

23. Career Orientation and Student Diversity: Little Restriction--Restricted

Does the teacher desire and/or feel competent to work with children of any background (i.e., no particular preferences), or does the teacher prefer to work with and/or even limit him/herself to working with only certain kinds of children?

Table 1

THE RANGE THAT EXISTED AMONG THE 13 STUDENTS

Knowledge and Curriculum

1. Knowledge is public -- Synthesis of knowledge is public-personal
2. Knowledge is product -- Synthesis of knowledge is product-process
3. Knowledge is certain -- Synthesis of knowledge is certain-problematic
4. Knowledge is fragmented -- Knowledge is holistic
5. Knowledge is unrelated -- Knowledge is integrated
6. Learning is an individual activity -- Synthesis of learning is an individual-collective activity
7. High control over pupil learning -- Low control over pupil learning

Teacher-Pupil Relationships

8. Distant -- Personal relationships with children
9. High control over pupil behavior -- Low control over pupil behavior

The Teacher's Role

10. What to teach: Bureaucratic--functional
11. How to teach: Bureaucratic--functional
12. School rules and regulations: Bureaucratic--functional

The Role of the Community in School Affairs

13. Community access to schools: Free access
14. Community involvement in curriculum and instruction: Passive--Active roles
15. Community involvement in school administration: No role

Table 1, Continued

16. The source of the teacher's problems: Individualistic--Sociopolitical
17. Solutions to the teacher's problems: Educational interventions only
Student Diversity
18. Children as members of a category -- Children as unique
19. School curriculum: Universalistic--particularistic
20. Student behavior: Universalistic--particularistic
21. Allocation of school resources: Equal--differential
22. Common culture -- Subgroup consciousness
23. Career orientation and student diversity: Little restriction--restricted